

PESP**UPDATE**

PESP is a voluntary public/private partnership committed to reducing the risks from pesticides in agricultural and nonagricultural settings

NEW MEMBERS

PARTNERS

Central Vermont Public Service Corporation
Cuyahoga County Board of Health
Hawaii Area Wide Fruit Fly Pest Management Program
Highlands Soil & Water
New England Fruit Consultants

SUPPORTERS

National Alliance of Independent Crop Consultants
North American Pollinator Protection Campaign

WHAT'S INSIDE

2003 PESP Champions

Recognized	2
National IPM in Schools Update	2
Biopesticide Demonstration Project	2
<i>Spotlight on PESP Member:</i> Pebble Beach Company	3
National Foundation for IPM Education Grant Funding Available	3
National Roadmap to IPM: What Is It and Where Is It Taking Us?	4
New Biopesticide Registration: Prolonging the Freshness of IPM and Organically Grown Fruits and Vegetables	5
Council for Agricultural Science and Technology: IPM Current and Future Strategies	5
PESP News Exchange	6
PESP Resources	6

ENVIRONMENTAL STEWARDSHIP BRANCH EMPHASIZES PESP SECTORS

EPA's Pollution Prevention Staff within the Biopesticide and Pollution Prevention Division (BPPD) recently was reorganized and renamed the Environmental Stewardship Branch (ESB). Environmental stewardship is a prominent theme in EPA's 5-year strategic plan.

Janet Andersen continues as the Director of BPPD. ESB is under the leadership of Steve Morrill, who came to BPPD in Fall 2002 from EPA's Registration Division. Steve is excited about his new position in ESB and expanding the role of PESP in promoting the use of safer pesticides and reducing pesticide risk.

The Pesticide Environmental Stewardship Program consists of 136 members. While these organizations are quite diverse, some share attributes that allow them to be grouped.

A growing program and need for

organizational efficiency have required ESB to divide the PESP members into *sectors*. These groupings allow us to manage the program more effectively and provide information specific to members who share concerns and pest management practices.

With these groupings, we hope we can better disseminate information and provide additional support to our constituents.

In addition, we hope to facilitate communication among the members in each sector, allowing the sector to become a networking tool that will accelerate members' progress implementing IPM practices and other pesticide risk-reduction activities.

PESP members should feel free to contact the head of each sector, who can provide general information about the sector and contact information on other members.

PESP SECTORS AND THEIR LEADERS

Antimicrobials	Susan Laing
Crop Consultants	Steve Hopkins
Commercial/Residential Pest Control	Ed Brandt
Environmental Organizations	Sherry Glick
Field/Row Crops	Michael Glikes
Food Processors	Frank Ellis
Government	Glenn Williams
Landscaping/Turf	Ed Brandt
Non-tree Fruits	Diana Horne
Organic	Diana Horne
Rights-of-Way	Glenn Williams
Schools	Sherry Glick
Trade Association	Steve Hopkins
Tree Fruits and Nuts	Cheryl Greene
Technology Transfer	Glenn Williams
Vegetables	Regina Langton

2003 PESP CHAMPIONS RECOGNIZED

Based on the strategies submitted in 2003, EPA is recognizing sixteen members of PESP for their outstanding efforts towards promoting integrated pest management (IPM) and reducing pesticide risk, and for their extraordinary level of commitment to protecting human health and the environment. As part of the strategy assessment process, the strategies were reviewed by liaisons, sector leaders, and the PESP management team.

After reviewing all PESP Strategies and identifying members who set ambitious goals and achieved significant risk reduction, EPA selected sixteen members as PESP Champions.

The PESP strategy process is intended to help members adopt risk reduction approaches in a consistent, goal-oriented way. It also is used to elicit information that will help EPA measure the success of the program.

More importantly, when members report their progress, we are able to share information and ideas with other members of PESP.

All 2003 strategies are now available on the PESP website (www.epa.gov/opppbd1/PESP/). We strongly encourage PESP members to view the strategies of other members, particularly those in the same sector, as they contain a wealth of ideas and information.

2003 PESP CHAMPIONS

Almond Board of California
American Mosquito Control Association
Audubon International Cooperative Sanctuary Program
California Tomato Commission
Gerber Products Company
Glades Crop Care, Inc.
Lodi-Woodbridge Winegrape Commission
Low Input Viticulture and Enology of Oregon
Maryland Department of Agriculture
Massey Services, Inc.
Michigan Asparagus Research, Inc.
Monroe County Community School Corporation
Pebble Beach Company
U.S. Department of Defense Armed Forces Pest Management Board
University of Wisconsin Center for Integrated Agricultural Systems
Walnut Marketing Board

NATIONAL IPM IN SCHOOLS UPDATE

The first *National Integrated Pest Management (IPM) in Schools Update* was released to over 500 people in June. The readers and participants may be scattered throughout the country and come from a wide variety of disciplines, but they share an interest in implementing IPM in public and private schools.

The *Schools Update* provides the latest information on IPM in school

achievements, events, and lessons learned. Topics include potential funding opportunities, highlights of successful IPM activists and implementors, a list of events and conferences, along with a wide variety of other informational and editorial pieces. The *Schools Update* will be distributed every 2-3 months.

To sign up for the *Schools Update*, which is distributed by e-mail, please contact:

Sherry Glick
Pesticides & Schools Coordinator
703-308-7035
glick.sherry@epa.gov



BIOPESTICIDE DEMONSTRATION PROJECT

EPA's Biopesticides and Pollution Prevention Division (BPPD) is undertaking a new initiative to promote biopesticides as risk reduction tools and gain recognition as effective pest management alternatives.

The Biopesticide Demonstration Project will be established as a competitive grants program in cooperation with the IR-4 Program administered by USDA.

The project initially will focus on demonstrations of effective microbial and biochemical pesticides on the agricultural sites of PESP members.

Teams comprised of representatives of grower groups, industry, and the

university research community will be invited to submit proposals demonstrating the effective use of one or more biopesticides in novel combinations to enhance field performance or biopesticides used as part of IPM programs in combination with conventional pesticides. The results of funded demonstration projects will be posted on BPPD's website.

Biopesticide registrants who wish to participate in the project will be asked to submit efficacy/product performance

data and perform analyses of the potential reduction in risk associated with the use of their products, as compared to conventional approaches.

BPPD strongly encourages biopesticide companies to cooperate with each other and with conventional pesticide companies to develop effective agricultural production systems that significantly reduce pesticide risk.



EPA contact:
Diana Horne
703-308-8367
horne.diana@epa.gov

SPOTLIGHT ON PESP MEMBER:

PEBBLE BEACH COMPANY

Pebble Beach Company was selected as a Champion of the Pesticide Environmental Stewardship Program by EPA for its commitment to environmental programs and practices that reduce pesticide use.

Pebble Beach Company incorporates environmental stewardship into all aspects of their golf course, resort, and residential management. The company completed most of the pesticide risk-reduction objectives it proposed in its strategy for 2002. Through its integrated pest management (IPM) goals and objectives for 2003, Pebble Beach continues to demonstrate its leadership in the field of IPM.



In 2002, Pebble Beach integrated risk-reduction practices and golf course management. For example, the company monitored for pesticides and fertilizers in storm water runoff as part of a biannual water quality monitoring program. All pesticides were found to be either non-detectable or below acceptable levels. Pebble Beach Company installed new state-of-the-art wash/rinse/mix/load treatment systems, which should reduce the risk of ground water contamination from pesticides at all four golf courses owned by Pebble Beach.

In addition, the company continued funding at a significant level research related to the resistance of Pitch Canker



Disease on Monterey pine trees. This research is geared toward finding ways to keep the trees free from beetle infestation by using natural methods to induce resistance, thereby, reducing the need for insecticides.

In the area of resort management, Pebble Beach Company planned a centralized purchasing system to track all of its chemical and pesticide purchases. Quantifying the usage information will allow the Company to gather data and maintain a baseline for tracking pesticide use in future years.

For the community and residential management areas of its properties, Pebble Beach Company includes IPM fact sheets in all new resident/renter packets on how to control household and garden pests by using pesticide alternatives.

For 2003, Pebble Beach Company continues making progress on all of these objectives, and plans to increase

native plant and tree planting as well as "no-mow" areas on golf courses.

In addition to the specific PESP objectives, Pebble Beach Company has several other environmental programs. These include protecting harbor seal rookeries from visitors in areas along the scenic 17-mile drive and encouraging the restoration of native plant habitat by donating native

plants to local organizations that focus on the rehabilitation and protection of native plant habitats.

The company also excels in wetland enhancement, water conservation, and water quality programs. Detailed information about these programs is provided on the company's website.

Pebble Beach Company's leadership role in environmental stewardship could be shared and implemented by other members of PESP's Landscaping/Turf Sector.



Pebble Beach Company Contact:
Roxayne Spruance
PO Box 1767
Pebble Beach, CA 93953-1767
831-625-8402
spruancer@pebblebeach.com

EPA Liaison:
Santhini Ramasamy
703-305-8133
ramasamy.santhini@epa.gov

NATIONAL FOUNDATION FOR IPM EDUCATION GRANT FUNDING AVAILABLE

The National Foundation for IPM Education (NFIPME) has announced the availability of at least \$260,000 for their PESP Project Grants. The call is open to organizations involved in work that reduces the risk and use of pesticides in agricultural and non-agricultural settings. Funding is limited to \$40,000 per project. These grants are awarded and administered by NFIPME. Proposals are due by December 30, 2003. Additional information is available on NFIPME's website (www.ipm-education.org).

NATIONAL ROADMAP TO IPM: WHAT IS IT AND WHERE IS IT TAKING US?

For the past couple of years, the IPM community has been aware of the *National Roadmap to IPM*, the result of a report by the U.S. General Accounting Office (GAO). Under the sponsorship of Senator Patrick Leahy of Vermont, GAO conducted an audit of USDA's IPM program in 2000-2001 to determine if USDA had met the goals of the IPM Initiative set in 1994.

The main goal of this Initiative was to foster the adoption of IPM practices on 75% of U.S. crop land by 2000. An anticipated outcome of achieving this goal was a reduction in pesticide use.

From 1994 through 2000, IPM adoption on U.S. crop land increased from 40% to around 71%, nearly reaching the stated goal, according to a survey of growers designed and administered by USDA. However, total pesticide use, measured as pounds of active ingredient, increased approximately 4%. Therefore, GAO concluded that even though the adoption goal was nearly reached, the desired outcome was not obtained because pesticide use did not decrease.

Based on interviews with GAO, USDA, and others, GAO explained that the use of pesticides listed as most *risky* by EPA had been reduced by 14% during the same time frame. In this case, pounds of pesticides used may not offer

the most appropriate measure of success of IPM programs in reducing pesticide risks.

Nevertheless, GAO concluded that, "The IPM initiative is missing several management elements identified in the Government Performance and Results Act (GPRA) that are essential for successful implementation of any Federal IPM efforts; coordination of IPM efforts is lacking among federal agencies and with the private sector; the intended results of these efforts have not been clearly articulated or prioritized; and the methods for measuring IPM's environmental and economic results have not been developed. Until these shortcomings are effectively addressed, the full range of potential benefits that IPM can yield for producers, the public, and the environment is unlikely to be realized."

In response to the GAO Report, USDA began drafting the *National Roadmap to IPM*. The Roadmap identifies strategic directions for research, implementation, and measurement activities needed to ensure that the full benefits of IPM adoption are realized.

The Roadmap was initiated in February 2002 by a national meeting attended by a wide range of stakeholders. Since then, the resulting document evolved from continuous input from many IPM experts, practitioners, and stakeholders.

To address some of the details in the Roadmap, USDA held the 4th National

IPM Symposium in Indianapolis, Indiana, in April, 2003, which was attended by over 700 people. The Symposium was so well received that it was viewed as something that would make a difference with IPM implementation nationally.

Plans are underway to hold another Symposium in 2006. Proceedings from the 2003 Symposium are available online at cipm.ncsu.edu/symposium/.

The Symposium's proceedings

contain presentations on a wide variety of IPM topics, including recognition and incentives, marketing IPM, new management technologies, evaluation and impact assessment, building partnerships, community IPM, education and outreach, biological control and bio-based IPM, vertebrate and wildlife IPM, strategic planning and visioning for IPM, invasive species, biotechnology, international IPM, systems approach and landscape interactions, IPM in

organic systems, successes in agriculture and urban IPM, and commodity related issues.

The latest version of the *National Roadmap to IPM* is available at: nepmc.org/national/roadmap/june172003.html

USDA Contact:
Allen Jennings, Director
Office of Pest Management Policy
202-720-5375
Allen.Jennings@usda.gov

The report recommended that the Secretary of Agriculture:

- Establish effective department-wide leadership, coordination, and management for federally funded IPM efforts;
- Clearly articulate and prioritize the results the Department wants to achieve from its IPM efforts, focus IPM efforts and resources on those results, and set measurable goals for achieving those results;
- Develop a method of measuring the progress of federally funded IPM activities toward the stated goals of the IPM initiative; and
- Collaborate with EPA to focus IPM research, outreach, and implementation on the pest management strategies that offer the greatest potential to reduce the risks associated with agricultural pesticides.



NEW BIOPESTICIDE REGISTRATION: **PROLONGING THE FRESHNESS OF IPM AND ORGANICALLY GROWN FRUITS AND VEGETABLES**

How can growers protect crops from decay, prolong the freshness of produce and cut flowers, and increase their yields? A new biopesticide registered for use on forty different crops can do all that, and it can be used as part of an IPM program or as certified organic in all states except Washington (where it is undergoing organic certification).

This product, SignaFresh Quality Enhancer™, is manufactured exclusively by NutraPark, Inc., of Madison, Wisconsin. On apples, for example, the product is applied two to three weeks before the fruit is harvested.

The active ingredient in SignaFresh is lysophospholipid (LPE), a naturally

occurring biomolecule derived from naturally abundant sources such as egg yolks and soybeans. LPE and other phospholipids are integral elements in the cell membranes of living organisms -- everything from plants to animals to humans -- and play a critical role in the biological life cycle.

Research shows that some phospholipids, such as LPE, affect the natural process of growth, maturation, and decay.

This discovery was made by Dr. Jiwan Palta of the University of Wisconsin while conducting research on how to reduce the impact of early frost on cranberries by accelerating the ripening of the fruit.

Benefits to some of the 40 crops on which SignaFresh is registered include:

Grapes: reduced shatter and moisture loss, resulting in reduced storage loss; also firmer grapes with improved color and storability.

Red Bell Peppers: more uniformity in red color with less green and truer red through the fruit; increased percentages of higher-grade fruit means improved grade mix and profits.

Peaches: improved color, brix content, size, and storability.

LPE technology also has been extensively studied on apples, cherries, pears, mushrooms, bananas, citrus, and berries, as well as on fresh cut flowers, bedding plants, and Christmas trees.



NutraPark's website:
www.nutrapark.com

EPA Contact:
Carol Frazer
703-308-8810
frazer.carol@epa.gov



COUNCIL FOR AGRICULTURAL SCIENCE AND TECHNOLOGY ***IPM CURRENT AND FUTURE STRATEGIES***

The Council for Agricultural Science and Technology (CAST), a nonprofit organization, recently released the guide *Integrated Pest Management Current and Future Strategies*.

Developed by over 40 scientists and reviewed by 20 additional experts, this guide provides a wealth of information on IPM tools, technologies, and controls in multiple formats. This report contains information on crop production systems, rangeland and pasture, natural areas, aquatic vegetation, and food animal IPM. The report also includes a



comparison of urban IPM and animal IPM, as well as a section on wildlife damage control. The public policy and economic ramifications also are discussed, with examples on how IPM is economically beneficial in the long-term.

If you are interested in obtaining a copy of this guide, please contact:

Council for Agricultural Science and Technology (CAST)
4420 West Lincoln Way
Ames, IA 50014-3447
515-292-2125
e-mail: cast@cast-science.org
website: www.cast-science.org

PESP News Exchange Launched

We hope that all PESP members have noticed (and had an opportunity to read) the e-mails that have started to appear in their inbox entitled, *PESP News Exchange*.

The *PESP News Exchange* is an e-mail based EPA specialty news and alert service. It is devoted to the advancement and exchange of information related to Pesticide Environmental Stewardship Program issues and activities.

News and alerts are tailored to the specific needs and requests of PESP members.

To discuss your information needs or find out more about this service contact:

Cheryl Greene
703-308-0352
greene.cheryl@epa.gov



YOUR COMMENTS ARE WELCOME

We continually seek to improve our communication with those who share an interest in PESP. Because we produce the Update with you in mind, your impressions of the information are valuable to us.

Please take a moment to send us an email (pesp.info@epa.gov) or leave us a voicemail message (800-972-7717) with your comments on the PESP Update.

We also welcome your suggestions for articles and topics you would like to see addressed.

PESP RESOURCES

Address: 1200 Pennsylvania Ave NW (7511C)
Washington, DC 20460
PESP InfoLine: 800-972-7717
EPA's PESP Web site: www.epa.gov/opbppd1/PESP
PESP e-Mail: pesp.info@epa.gov
You may reach all EPA personnel by e-mail at: lastname.firstname@epa.gov
National Foundation for IPM Education's PESP Website: www.pesp.org

To be placed on our mailing list or to provide address changes, please call 800-972-7717 or send an email to pesp.info@epa.gov.

FIRST CLASS MAIL
POSTAGE & FEES PAID
EPA
PERMIT NO. G-35

United States
Environmental Protection
Agency
Washington, DC 20460
Official Business
Penalty for Private Use
\$300

